

Org 1 Members of Congress
For Peace through Law

Fulbright, J. William
C. A. 8.03 AC

wealthy persons, according to Sandford A. Persons, a staff consultant to the group. He said \$65,000 was raised at a dinner in

the Capitol in September at which 33 persons dined with about 40 members of Congress. Since then, additional pledges have been obtained at similar dinners in Baltimore and New York, he said.

The group suggested savings. But some of Rivers' bargain through cuts in Safeguard, multiple warheads, the B-1 bomber, F-14, F-15, F-111A and Harrier airplanes, a number of Navy programs and reductions in American troop strength over stored.

Thus, the decisions reached

Some of the proposed reductions would result from delays of programs, however, and might not produce real savings in the long run.

The debate will center around the administration's request for \$20.6 billion for procurement and research—a little less than a third of the total defense budget request of \$71.8 billion.

The House cut only \$34 million from the administration request, although it did take away some money the administration wanted for some things and voted funds for other things that had not been requested—primarily for ship construction.

The Senate Armed Services Committee cut the request by \$1.3 billion.

In a 150-page report issued recently the military spending committee of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law said the budget should be cut even deeper—by a total of \$4.4 billion to \$5.4 billion. Hatfield is chairman of the committee.

The report, which is being reproduced in the Congressional Record, is the most detailed analysis critics of military spending have ever had available to them. Much of the work on the report was done by staff members of interested senators and representatives. Their work was coordinated by Ronald Lee Hammen, a 26-year-old former Central Intelligence Agency employee now working for MCPL.

In last year's debate, the funds for Safeguard were passed by only one vote in the Senate. The sentiment against it may be even stronger this year. But a more limited program than that proposed by the administration — such as the one backed by the Stennis panel — could be more palatable to several members of the Senate, and swing their votes over to the favorable side.

To some extent, the action of the committee in cutting as deeply as it did into the administration request is probably preparation for an eventual bargaining session with the House.

The chairman of the conference between the two houses this
 0-01315R000300520005-0
 ers, D-S.C., chairman of the
 House Armed Services Commit-